

**REMARKS**

It is submitted that these claims, as originally presented, are patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112. Changes to these claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103 or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicant is entitled.

Claims 2-6 have been canceled. Amended claim 1 and new claims 7-8 are in the application.

The drawings were objected to because box 5-2 in Fig. 1 “requires appropriate descriptive labels.” A replacement Fig. 1 is submitted herein which addresses this matter.

Line 8 of page 5 of the specification was objected to because “the word persona” was mis-spelled. The specification has been amended herein to correct this matter.

Claims 3-4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Claim 3 was rejected as being vague for the recitation of “a third icon” in line 3. Claim 4 was rejected as being vague for the recitation of “a fourth icon” in line 3. As previously indicated, claims 3-4 have been canceled.

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stefik (U.S. Patent No. 5,629,980) in view of Hahn (U.S. Patent No. 5,751,287).

Claim 1 as presented herein recites in part the following:

“setting means for setting an icon corresponding to the right information out of different forms of icons representative of said rights information; and

display means for displaying the icon set by said setting means.”  
(Emphasis added.)

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Stefik and Hahn applied by the Examiner does not disclose the above features of claim 1. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 is distinguishable from the applied combination of Stefik and Hahn.

For reasons similar to or somewhat similar to those described with regard to claim 1, it is also submitted that new independent claims 7-8 are distinguishable over the applied combination of Stefik and Hahn.


In the event, that the Examiner disagrees with any of the foregoing comments concerning the disclosures in the cited prior art, it is requested that the Examiner indicate where, in the reference or references, there is the basis for a contrary view.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that all of the claims in this application are patentable over the prior art, and early and favorable consideration thereof is solicited.

Please charge any fees incurred by reason of this response and not paid herewith to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,  
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: \_\_\_\_\_

  
Dennis M. Smid  
Reg. No. 34,930  
(212) 588-0800